



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,742	07/26/2005	Ulrike Wachendorf-Neumann	2400.0250001/LVC	3030

26111 7590 03/31/2009
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

LEVY, NEIL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/31/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/518,742

Applicant(s)

WACHENDORFF-NEUMANN ET AL.

Examiner

NEIL LEVY

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/17/04;4/19/07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The mixtures and methods are not shown to be synergistic. Synergy depends on effects on a specific pest; not required as claimed. One is told to perform experimentation to determine whether or not synergy exists. It would require an excessive degree of experimentation to identify each and every fungal organism in each and every growth stage, on each and every part of a plant, or soil types, or storage areas at each of the required dosage ranges, to determine, which if any, are synergistic.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 38 U. S. C. 112, the first paragraph have been described in *Wands*, 8 USPQ2D 1400 (Fed Cir. 1988). Among these factors are (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims. (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that instant disclosure fails to meet the enablement requirement for the following reasons:

- (1) The nature of the invention: claims are to unqualified synergistic compositions
- (2) The state of the prior art shows the use of these compounds for specific functions.
- (3) The relative skill of those in the art. The relative skill of those in the art is high.

- (4) The predictability or unpredictability of the art. The unpredictability of the art is very high.
- (5) The breadth of the claims. The claims are very broad, as no limitations on synergy is claimed- no conditions, target organisms & substrate,
- (6) The amount of direction or guidance presented. There are - the results expected are presumptive,
- (7) The presence or absence of working examples. There is, but not demonstrating absolute synergy; only as related to a target organism.
- (8) The quantity of experimentation necessary is extensive-

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

ZIMMERMAN-us007179824b2

ZIMMERMAN presents compounds & compositions (col. 29,30) to control insects & with the instant methods of application (col. 35) in combination with additional fungicides (col. 32, Lines 44-57), inclusive of prothioconazole & trifloxystrobin (col. 33, lines 41,45) .

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made desiring to utilize combination pest control means, to use ZIMMERMAN modified as

desired to increase stability, the range of toxicity to include fungus along with insect control.

All the critical elements of the instant are disclosed. The amounts and proportions of each ingredient are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would be obvious to vary the form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, depending upon the particular species and application method of interest, reduction of toxicity, cost minimization, enhanced, and prolonged, or synergistic effects.

Applicant has not provided any objective evidence of criticality, nonobvious or unexpected results that the administration of the particular ingredients' or concentrations provides any greater or different level of prior art expectation as claimed, and the use of ingredient for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not basis for patentability.

The instant invention provides well known old art recognized compounds, with well known art recognized effects, applied by well known art recognized methods to achieve improved control as is well known in the art.

Claims 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISCHER et al US 2004/0102326

See compound 10 and 13, either or both, and other of 55 compounds [0269].

The instant ratios are [0272] of trifloxystrobin of 1:10, and of prothioconazole of 1:10.

Application rates are also of the instant [0331] at 0.1-10,000g/ha.

Synergy is determined as in the instant [0464-0470].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made desiring to utilize combination pest control means, to use FISCHER modified as

desired to increase stability, the range of toxicity to include fungus along with insect control.

All the critical elements of the instant are disclosed. The amounts and proportions of each ingredient are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would be obvious to vary the form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, depending upon the particular species and application method of interest, reduction of toxicity, cost minimization, enhanced, and prolonged, or synergistic effects.

Applicant has not provided any objective evidence of criticality, nonobvious or unexpected results that the administration of the particular ingredients' or concentrations provides any greater or different level of prior art expectation as claimed, and the use of ingredient for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not basis for patentability.

The instant invention provides well known old art recognized compounds, with well known art recognized effects, applied by well known art recognized methods to achieve improved control as is well known in the art.

Claims 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BERGER et al US2004/0209923

Plants are protected with mixes of actives [0001] applied to plant parts and soil [0028].

- A. Formulations are shown to include surfactants [0255-0257] and the instant fungicides-one or more [0259].

Seed coatings are shown-1.75-0.15% active.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made desiring to utilize combination pest control means, to use BERGER modified as

desired to increase stability, the range of toxicity to include fungus along with insect control.

All the critical elements of the instant are disclosed. The amounts and proportions of each ingredient are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would be obvious to vary the form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, depending upon the particular species and application method of interest, reduction of toxicity, cost minimization, enhanced, and prolonged, or synergistic effects.

Applicant has not provided any objective evidence of criticality, nonobvious or unexpected results that the administration of the particular ingredients' or concentrations provides any greater or different level of prior art expectation as claimed, and the use of ingredient for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not basis for patentability.

The instant invention provides well known old art recognized compounds, with well known art recognized effects, applied by well known art recognized methods to achieve improved control as is well known in the art.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 10-is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 2 of copending Application No. 10505440. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 6-19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7 -9, 11 & 12 of copending Application No. 10505440. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because The 505 application anticipates the instant mixes and fungicides.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 6-10,13,14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 8-10 of copending Application No. 10/563328

. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because The 10/ anticipates the instant claims

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 6-19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim9-12, 14, 15 of copending Application No. 10/518668. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because The 10/ anticipates the instant claims

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims6-19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6-9 of copending Application

No. 10/518669. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because The 10/ anticipates the instant claims This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL LEVY whose telephone number is 571-272-0619. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7 AM to 5:30 PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL WOODWARD can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/NEIL LEVY/

Application/Control Number: 10/518,742
Art Unit: 1615

Page 10

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615

**3/16/09*